UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,317	04/26/2007	David Jones	4810-75994-01	4955
24197 7590 01/14/2009 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET		9	EXAMINER	
			MI, QIUWEN	
SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, O	OR 97204		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No. 10/582,317		Applicant(s)	
		JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	QIUWEN MI	1655	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of tapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places tapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Reque for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:	the
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN T	
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	***
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension feet have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension feet under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely file may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ee) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 December 2008. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months	s of
the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	he
7. Torr purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of	
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .	
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-24</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>25-28,30-34,45-49 and 52-58</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	1
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in	
condition for allowance because:	
See Continuation Sheet.	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	
13. Other:	
/h // _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	
/Michele Flood/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Applicant's argument about Wood science and Holzfoschung (page 8, last paragraph), Soxhlet extraction can be performed in batches. Concerning the argument about Holzforschung paper (page 9, 2nd paragraph; page 11, 2nd paragraph), Johansson et al explicitly teach extractives are composed of tropolones, and tropolones are the main target of extraction in current claim 1, thus the reference does not teach away from the current invention. Regarding the argument about Diebold et al (page 9, last two paragraphs), Diebold et al explicitly teach lignin extraction and separation from crude cellulose (col 1, lines 48-52), thus the 103 rejection stands for the reasons of the record. Regarding the yield of tropolones in Wood science, Table 4 explicitly teaches the yield of tropolones is 4%, which means 4 g out of 100 g western red cedar heartwood and mechanical pulps, and the alledgedly surprising result in Example 1 of the specification does not mention anything about tropolone yield at all. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, and therefore the rejections in the record are maintained..